

(B) Grouping the loans by repayment period and using the repayment period for each group for the range of values of variable “t”; and

(C) For each group of loans, as applicable, multiplying the total annual payments due on the loans by the institution's loan collection rate (*e.g.*, the total amount of payments collected divided by the total amount of payments due). The resulting amount is used for variable “R” in each period “t”, for each group of loans that a NPV is calculated.

(2) Instead of performing the calculations in paragraph (b)(1) of this section, using 50 percent of the total amount of loans that the institution made during the fiscal year as the NPV. However, if the institution chooses to use this 50 percent calculation, the institution may not sell any of these loans until they have been in repayment for at least two years.

(c) *Sanctions.* If an institution does not derive at least 10 percent of its revenue from sources other than Title IV, HEA program funds—

(1) For two consecutive fiscal years, it loses its eligibility to participate in the Title IV, HEA programs for at least two fiscal years. To regain eligibility, the institution must demonstrate that it complied with the State licensure and accreditation requirements under 34 CFR 600.5(a)(4) and (a)(6), and the financial responsibility requirements under subpart L of this part, for a minimum of two fiscal years after the fiscal year it became ineligible; or

(2) For any fiscal year, it becomes provisionally certified under § 668.13(c)(1)(ii) for the two fiscal years after the fiscal year it failed to satisfy the revenue requirement. However, the institution's provisional certification terminates on—

(i) The expiration date of the institution's program participation agreement that was in effect on the date the Secretary determined the institution failed this requirement; or

(ii) The date the institution loses its eligibility to participate under paragraph (c)(1) of this section; and

(3) It must notify the Secretary no later than 45 days after the end of its

fiscal year that it failed to meet this requirement.

(Approved by Office of Management and Budget under control number 1845-NEW2)

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1085, 1088, 1091, 1092, 1094, 1099a-3, 1099c, 1141)

[74 FR 55937, Oct. 29, 2009]

APPENDIX A TO SUBPART B OF PART 668—STANDARDS FOR AUDIT OF GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS, PROGRAMS, ACTIVITIES, AND FUNCTIONS (GAO)

Part III Chapter 3—Independence

(a) The Third general standard for governmental auditing is: In matters relating to the audit work, the audit organization and the individual auditors shall maintain an independent attitude.

(b) This standard places upon the auditor and the audit organization the responsibility for maintaining sufficient independence so that their opinions, conclusions, judgments, and recommendations will be impartial. If the auditor is not sufficiently independent to produce unbiased opinions, conclusions, and judgments, he should state in a prominent place in the audit report his relationship with the organization or officials being audited.¹

(c) The auditor should consider not only whether his or her own attitude and beliefs permit him or her to be independent but also whether there is anything about his or her situation which would lead others to question his or her independence. Both situations deserve consideration since it is important not only that the auditor be, in fact, independent and impartial but also that other persons will consider him or her so.

(d) There are three general classes of impairments that the auditor needs to consider; these are personal, external, and organizational impairments. If one or more of these are of such significance as to affect the auditor's ability to perform his or her work and report its results impartially, he or she should decline to perform the audit or indicate in the report that he or she was not fully independent.

Personal Impairments

There are some circumstances in which an auditor cannot be impartial because of his or

¹If the auditor is not fully independent because he or she is an employee of the audited entity, it will be adequate disclosure to so indicate. If the auditor is a practicing certified public accountant, his or her conduct should be governed by the AICPA “Statements on Auditing Procedure.”

her views or his or her personal situation. These circumstances might include:

1. Relationships of an official, professional, and/or personal nature that might cause the auditor to limit the extent or character of the inquiry, to limit disclosure, or to weaken his or her findings in any way.
2. Preconceived ideas about the objectives or quality of a particular operation or personal likes or dislikes of individuals, groups, or objectives of a particular program.
3. Previous involvement in a decision-making or management capacity in the operations of the governmental entity or program being audited.
4. Biases and prejudices, including those induced by political or social convictions, which result from employment in or loyalty to a particular group, entity, or level of government.
5. Actual or potential restrictive influence when the auditor performs preaudit work and subsequently performs a post audit.
6. Financial interest, direct or indirect, in an organization or facility which is benefiting from the audited programs.

External Impairments

External factors can restrict the audit or impinge on the auditor's ability to form independent and objective opinions and conclusions. For example, under the following conditions either the audit itself could be adversely affected or the auditor would not have complete freedom to make an independent judgment.²

1. Interference or other influence that improperly or imprudently eliminates, restricts, or modifies the scope or character of the audit.
2. Interference with the selection or application of audit procedures of the selection of activities to be examined.
3. Denial of access to such sources of information as books, records, and supporting documents or denial or opportunity to obtain explanations by officials and employees of the governmental organization, program, or activity under audit.
4. Interference in the assignment of personnel to the audit task.
5. Retaliatory restrictions placed on funds or other resources dedicated to the audit operation.
6. Activity to overrule or significantly influence the auditors judgment as to the appropriate content of the audit report.
7. Influences that place the auditor's continued employment in jeopardy for reasons other than competency or the need for audit services.

²Some of these situations may constitute justifiable limitations on the scope of the work. In such cases the limitation should be identified in the auditor's report.

8. Unreasonable restriction on the time allowed to competently complete an audit assignment.

Organizational Impairments

(a) The auditor's independence can be affected by his or her place within the organizational structure of governments. Auditors employed by Federal, State, or local government units may be subject to policy direction from superiors who are involved either directly or indirectly in the government management process. To achieve maximum independence such auditors and the audit organization itself not only should report to the highest practicable echelon within their government but should be organizationally located outside the line-management function of the entity under audit.

(b) These auditors should also be sufficiently removed from political pressures to ensure that they can conduct their auditing objectively and can report their conclusions completely without fear of censure. Whenever feasible they should be under a system which will place decisions on compensation, training, job tenure, and advancement on a merit basis.

(c) When independent public accountants or other independent professionals are engaged to perform work that includes inquiries into compliance with applicable laws and regulations, efficiency and economy of operations, or achievement of program results, they should be engaged by someone other than the officials responsible for the direction of the effort being audited. This practice removes the pressure that may result if the auditor must criticize the performance of those by whom he or she was engaged. To remove this obstacle to independence, governments should arrange to have auditors engaged by officials not directly involved in operations to be audited.

[51 FR 41921, Nov. 19, 1986. Redesignated at 65 FR 65650, Nov. 1, 2000]

APPENDIX B TO SUBPART B OF PART 668—APPENDIX I, STANDARDS FOR AUDIT OF GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS, PROGRAMS, ACTIVITIES, AND FUNCTIONS (GAO)

Qualifications of Independent Auditors Engaged by Governmental Organizations

(a) When outside auditors are engaged for assignments requiring the expression of an opinion on financial reports of governmental organizations, only fully qualified public accountants should be employed. The type of qualifications, as stated by the Comptroller General, deemed necessary for financial audits of governmental organizations and programs is quoted below: